



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/561,462

12/20/2005

Jean Gobert

FR 030069

8221

65913

7590

04/14/2009

NXP, B.V.

NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT

M/S41-SJ

1109 MCKAY DRIVE

SAN JOSE, CA 95131

EXAMINER

YENKE, BRIAN P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/14/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

|                          |                                      |                                      |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/561,462 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>GOBERT ET AL. |  |
|                          | <b>Examiner</b><br>BRIAN P. YENKE    | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2622              |  |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) BRIAN P. YENKE (Examiner). (3) Scott Pojunas.

(2) Patrick Wamsley. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 08 April 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: Li et al., US 6,549,814.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner reviewed/agreed to applicant's proposed amendment to remove the 35 USC 101 rejection. Applicant's also proposed newly amended claims (and added claims) to overcome the Lie reference, which the examiner noted the amended claims appear to overcome the art of record, but a further review of the Li reference would be required.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/BRIAN P. YENKE/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2622